



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,665	02/11/2005	Volker Hennige	265368US0XPCT	1535
22850 7590 03/15/2010 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER RHEE, JANE J	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/15/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
4

5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES
8

9
10 *Ex parte* VOLKER HENNIGE, CHRISTIAN HYING,
11 GERHARD HORPEL, and SVEN AUGUSTIN
12

13
14 Appeal 2009-011171
15 Application 10/524,665
16 Technology Center 1700
17

18
19 Oral Hearing Held: January 21, 2010
20

21
22 Before BRADLEY R. GARRIS, CHARLES F. WARREN, and
23 TERRY J. OWENS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
24

25 APPEARANCES:

26
27 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:

28
29 HARRIS A. PITLICK, ESQUIRE
30 Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, LLP
31 1940 Duke Street
32 Eleventh Floor
33 Alexandria, Virginia 22314
34
35
36
37
38

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, January
2 21, 2010, commencing at 9:12a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office,
3 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Deborah Rinaldo, Notary
4 Public.

5 JUDGE GARRIS: I think we're ready to start the next one.

6 MR. PITLICK: Okay. In this case, somewhat related technology and I realize
7 since this is being recorded, no one will know what I'm talking about, but at
8 any rate, we can ignore what I just said and I'll start from the beginning.

9 The invention here is a separator electrode unit, again, for use in a battery such
10 as a lithium battery.

11 So we have a porous electrode and we have a separator which is inorganic. It's
12 got -- there's an inorganic separator layer which has two fractions of metal
13 oxide particles. And one fraction has an average particle size that's greater
14 than the pore size of the electrode and another fraction having a pore size -- a
15 particle size that's less -- that's less than the average pore size of the porous
16 electrode. And the metal oxides don't have to be the same for each.

17 So we have one rejection, namely under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamashita, et al.,
18 in view of Penth, et al.

19 Yamashita, et al., has a porous separator, doesn't say anything specifically
20 about the porosity of the electrode, but we're not arguing that it's not porous,
21 but -- we are not really sure whether it is or not. But the main point is, again,
22 our separator is inorganic, Yamashita requires an organic binder.

23 And while the term preferably does -- or "preferred" appears one time in there,
24 I think it's clear from the disclosure as a whole in Yamashita that they have to
25 have the organic binder because there's no other disclosed way of, in effect,
26 binding the remaining materials in their separator.

1 So the Examiner relies on Penth, et al., for purposes of showing the inorganic
2 separator of the present claims. But as we pointed out, Penth, et al., discloses
3 nothing about the particular use as a separator in a battery. As we've pointed
4 out, Penth is basically drawn to the ability of their material to be catalytically
5 active.

6 And while various utilities are disclosed in Penth, they are all pretty much
7 geared to being able to use that as being catalytically active.

8 Now, the Examiner relies on the fact that the words "cathode" and "anode"
9 appear in Penth. But it's clear it has nothing to do with a cathode or anode that
10 would be used in a lithium battery.

11 So even if one skilled in the art were to combine Yamashita and Penth, and we
12 believe they wouldn't do that without our disclosure as a guide, the result
13 would not be the presently claimed invention on many levels certainly.

14 One level certainly is the fact that you have the two particle size ranges and the
15 fact that the ranges are related to the pore size of the electrode.

16 So again, I think it's a pretty straightforward case here and certainly will be
17 happy to answer any questions you might have.

18 JUDGE GARRIS: Any questions?

19 JUDGE WARREN: No.

20 JUDGE OWEN: No.

21 JUDGE GARRIS: No questions. Thank you very much, Mr. Pitlick.

22 MR. PITLICK: You are welcome.

23 Whereupon, the proceedings at 9:16 a.m., were concluded.

24

25

26